

Legislative Commission on the  
Fair Treatment of College Student-Athletes  
January 10, 2019

The Legislative Commission on the Fair Treatment of College Student-Athletes met Thursday, January 10, 2019 at 1 p.m. in Room 643 in the Legislative Office Building. Lieutenant Governor Dan Forest, Chair of the Commission, presided during the meeting. Commission Members present were: Representatives John Fraley, Jon Hardister, Ken Goodman, and Senators Warren Daniel, Joyce Krawiec, Floyd McKissick. Staff Members present were: Brian Gwyn and Kara McCraw. Jayne Nelson served as the Committee Clerk. The Sergeant-at-Arms that provided assistance during the meeting were Terry McCraw, Jim Moran and Thomas Terry (House), and Tom Burroughs, Jim Hamilton and Frances Patterson (Senate). The Commission was called to order by Chairman Forest at 1:05 p.m

The first order of business was the approval of November 8<sup>th</sup> minutes (see attachment 1). Senator McKissick moved to approve the minutes, the motion carried.

The Chair then introduced Paul Haagen, Professor of Law and Co-Director of the Center for Sports Law and Policy, Duke University School of Law. His presentation addressed the current legal landscape for compensation and process for student athletes (see attachment 2). Mr. Haagen gave an overview of the history of public oversight concerning college student athletes up to what he considers the present unsettled times. Mr. Haagen addressed payment to athletes, who would pay it and how much would they be paid, as well as sports as an economic activity and the Rule of Reason Anti-trust law defense that the NCAA relies on. From a legal perspective he stated the simple “work around” for NCAA regulations would be to require the same regulations of all students. He brought up two court cases involving due process that have addressed problems with the NCAA regulations: NCAA v. Tarkanian and NCAA v. Miller. Mr. Haagen said he was not speaking on behalf of Duke University nor have an opinion but merely giving background.

After the presentation, Sen. McKissick asked if Mr. Haagen had recommendations for future legislation. Mr. Haagen replied the protections outlined on the last slide of his presentation: reporting requirements, safety and health and academic protections. Sen. McKissick also asked if Mr. Haagen had any articles or individual studies he could recommend. Mr. Haagen responded that he did and would send the studies to the committee, especially concerning labor laws and anti-trust issues. He also stated that new writings on the anti-trust issues were coming in February, so the committee should wait to see what those included. Chairman Forest directed staff to send the studies to the members of the committee.

Rep. Fraley commented that it was important to note that the National Labor Relations Board voted unanimously, opposed to legal counsel, against the decision to decline

jurisdiction over student-athletes as employees, which was characterized in the press as the board dismissing a unionization effort.

Chancellor Philip L. Dubois, UNC-Charlotte was introduced by the Chair to address the committee concerning Student-Athlete Process for Outside Representation, Transfer and Rules Enforcement. Chancellor Dubois gave a power point presentation and distributed information in the form of handouts concerning procedures, the UNC Policy manual and UNC Charlotte University Policy 406, Code of Student Responsibility (see attachments 3, 3a, 3b and 3c).

Due to a technical malfunction, the recording equipment did not function during Chancellor Dubois's presentation, and as a result, those comments are not reflected in the minutes.

Sen. Krawiec asked why the UNC-Charlotte students did not respond to a survey. Chancellor Dubois responded that they do fill out a questionnaire at the end of eligibility, but the way the survey was collected in their packets did not provide for anonymity which would have caused disclosure problems. Sen. Krawiec asked if the student code of conduct was clear about sanctions for violations. Chancellor Dubois answered that it is but may vary a little from school to school and it also depends on whether it is a minor or major violation and the track record of the student, but the Code of Conduct is clear. Sen. Krawiec asked if there is a coach's code of conduct. Athletic Director Cunningham of UNC was recognized to address the question. He stated that surveys and questionnaires are given to the students and others to fill out, but there is no prescribed set of rules although there are things written into the coach's contracts for dismissal for activities that would prove harmful to students or the institution as well as criminal behavior. An intensive orientation for coaches, policies and procedures, and additional policies and procedures if needed are sent to legal counsel for approval and added to the department policies. Chancellor Dubois said coaches do have the discretion to sit an athlete down for bad student behavior for a game or more without affecting the aid agreement.

Sen. Daniel asked if Chancellor Dubois knew why the other three schools have not submitted surveys. Chancellor Dubois did not know. Drew Moretz, UNC General Administration was recognized and explained the students were told it would be confidential and not shared. They honored the agreement with the students.

Chairman Forest introduced Maddie Salamone, Attorney, Former Chair of Division 1 SAAC and Former Duke Lacrosse Player to address student athlete representation, rules enforcement and her perspective from the field (see attachment 4). Ms. Salmone stated students have no meaningful representation on campus. She discussed the problems associated with the regulations surrounding the student athlete scholarships, lack of counseling whether mental or regarding a transfer, mistreatment that goes unrecorded, no advisors to talk with confidentially, that coaches have all the power and that there is no definition of amateurism. She further stated that rules prevent the money from going toward the athletes and instead directs it to the buildings, coaches and independent

counsel. Her comments supported her opinion that a conflict of interest exists with intercollegiate athletics, and the need for legislation to govern principles for conduct.

Sen. McKissick asked if changes in representation and residency rules would solve the issues Ms. Salamone described. Ms. Salamone answered that an independent representation to aid the student in those issues as well as other issues would be appropriate and the cost would be paid for by the individual institutions, but not by the athletic divisions so as to alleviate pressure. Sen. McKissick asked if the best way to do this would be statewide and Ms. Salamone answered that was her opinion. Sen. McKissick asked if the transfer residency issue was eliminated would this be one of what she sees as a priority. Ms. Salamone responded that it would make it easier for the student athlete to leave a bad situation more easily like non-athlete students. Sen. McKissick asked if there was any empirical data to support the new transfer rules that took effect this past fall. Ms. Salamone replied there is not that the rule is too new and previous information was probably not collected.

Sen. Krawiec asked if the scholarship is safe once the athlete enters the program citing a previous committee meeting where she had been assured they were safe. Chancellor Dubois was recognized to answer. He said this had to do with the recent change in transfer students and if they went into the transfer portal whether they would keep their scholarship forever or could it be removed if moving to another institution. The previous comment that she was referring to was about removing student scholarships in general for athletic performance or other reasons and with the autonomy regulations, it is not permitted. Sen. Krawiec asked if she were a student athlete and the coach did not want her to play, her scholarship could be revoked or not? Ms. Salamone said there was no meaningful answer that she could give based on different circumstances of each individual athlete.

The Chair recognized Michelle Lee, Associate Athletic Director and Senior Woman Administrator at NC State University to address the previous question. Ms. Lee responded that there are only a few circumstances where the scholarship money can be terminated or reduced during a term and cited the reasons as: voluntarily quitting the team, violating the student code of conduct, fraudulently representing yourself and she added that the coach not wanting you in the program is not a valid circumstance.

Rep. Goodman spoke and commented that he understands that most athletic scholarships are for one year not four and at the end of the year the coach can renew it or not. Most conferences yes, but under new rules some conferences have started to offer four year scholarships. Rep. Goodman asked Chancellor Dubois to address counseling that is provided for students or student athletes within the University System; he stated he was under the impression that students as well as student athletes have counseling provided on the campuses. Chancellor Dubois answered that all campuses have mental health counseling with some variations. All students on all campuses pay a counseling center fee for access for support. He further stated that the students have their parents, personal counselors and can call the NCAA for clarity on the regulations. Rep. Fraley reminded the Commission members of the past meetings and that it is good to hear from the field, but many also have had good experiences. Ms.

Salamone responded that the student athlete still needs a place to go where they feel comfortable to get counseling when a bad situation occurs.

Rep. Hardister asked if the Dean of Student Affairs play a role in this. Chancellor Dubois responded that probably not unless it involves a judicial code of conduct issue.

Sen. Daniel asked Ms. Salamone about her experience as a player on the Women's Duke Lacrosse team, how many years did you play, did you transfer and how you can extend yourself past your own experience at Duke. Ms. Salamone said she talked to many students and friends at several schools to get their opinions, experiences and what kind of advocacy they thought would be beneficial. She stated she played for 4 years at Duke with one year of eligibility that she did not take, had three knee surgeries and her body was quitting on her by the fifth year so she stopped playing. She emphasized the large part injuries play in an athletes' career and as a professional athlete. She also stated that the Staff of the NCAA push for what they want and do not always help the athlete and skew information. Staff is not equipped to advise, representation is still needed.

Chairman Forest then introduced John Shoop who is a history teacher and an assistant coach at A. C. Reynolds High School in Asheville (see attachment 5). Mr. Shoop gave a timeline of his experience with athletics from the college level as a player, his employment as an assistant coach with the NFL and then his employment as an assistant coach at UNC Chapel Hill. Mr. Shoop gave an overview of the time he spent with players and the abuse and injustices they endured as student athletes. He stated that he witnessed the lack of due process, fair representation and transparency in the process when a player is accused of an NCAA violation. Mr. Shoop through his personal experience recruiting and coaching student athletes, expressed the need for advocacy, dignity, fairness and respect from the school's athletic departments, the school's legal counsel and the NCAA. He further commented that in his opinion this Legislative Commission on the Fair Treatment of College Student –Athletes is not a sports commission but a human rights commission.

Senator McKissick asked what his idea of how to implement advocacy for each student athlete would work. Mr. Shoop responded that a pool of pro bono lawyers would handle advocacy, but not as agents – that dual relationships do not work and would not be allowed. Senator McKissick asked if there is anything to prevent these pools being set up now or does this need to legislation to make this happen. Mr. Shoop answered that there is nothing legally to prevent student athletes from getting a lawyer, but North Carolina should be (1) an organizational model for the rest of the country and (2) financial-most players do not have the resources to hire a lawyer or know the steps to go through to hire one. Senator McKissick asked if there is any requirement comparable to the Miranda rights for athletes before they are being interrogated about a major matter. Mr. Shoop responded that there is nothing comparable to the Miranda rights for student athletes and in his opinion, the entire process is intentionally messy and ambiguous to serve those in power. He further stated that it is purposefully ambiguous for the Commission in this room to be discussing whether a scholarship is for four or five years.

The Chair then introduced former Supreme Court Justice and attorney for various college athletes, Bob Orr. Justice Orr gave his presentation that spoke to what he sees as the flawed system of governance surrounding college athletics and applauded the Commission for taking up a groundbreaking issue for legislation. Justice Orr asked the Commission to keep in mind that (1) the NCAA is a membership organization (2) if there is a problem, take it up with the institutional leaders at the schools (3) the NCAA is not held to the right for due process (4) The process of enforcement of NCAA rules against the players is fundamentally unfair, due process is lacking and unacceptable means of punishing the student. (5) the NCAA concept is guilty until proven innocent and a lack of transparency in the entire process (6) the NCAA operates on the concept of self-policing at the institution and is founded on the principle of eligibility (7) the NCAA has the power to punish the school if a player is deemed ineligible and the school quickly pulls the students' eligibility rather than risk the chance of championships and forfeiture of money earned if an athlete is deemed ineligible that has played (8) the student becomes disposable and creates a conflict of interest (9) the first thing a school does is protect the institution. Justice Orr further stated that the NCAA is a national disgrace and gave examples to support these statements including the Devin Ramsey tutor case accusing him of academic fraud and that the student had no rights to appeal only the university had the right to appeal the NCAA decision. He stated that there are no rights within the NCAA rules to protect students.

Another case involving the NCAA conducting a random urine test found traces of ostarine in some student athletes before a bowl game which was not listed as a prohibited drug in the NCAA manual although there is a loophole to include drugs in a certain class whether specifically listed or not. This resulted in immediate ineligibility regardless of mitigating circumstances.

Schools with limited resources may have the lack of staff to comply with all eligibility certifications but the NCAA does not care if one has made an honest mistake, and will be put on probation, forfeit championships and fined.

Justice Orr concluded by repeating the need for students to have a set of rights that would apply to all NCAA membership sports. He stated that the NCAA and the member schools hide behind the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act by keeping the public and the media in the dark; however the student athlete has to sign a waiver with the NCAA to ignore FERPA if revealing the information is in the best interest of the NCAA. Justice Orr said he looked forward to recommendations from this Commission to do a better job of protecting these young men and women.

Rep. Goodman asked if the NCAA is selective in their investigations and are punishments consistent. Justice Orr replied no that it depends on the resources and assets to fight the NCAA. Non-revenue sports at smaller schools are at a disadvantage and that there is no reason the institutions should not have a group of attorneys to advise students in these situations.

Sen. McKissick asked if the ombudsmen would be better utilized at each school or cross institutional. Justice Orr replied cross institutional would be more affordable for the

smaller schools as well as have one or more attorneys knowledgeable of the rules with no allegiance to any one school. Sen. McKissick asked for a more in depth explanation of the FERPA waiver and what it consists of. Justice Orr said it is a one page document that buries all of these controversies.

Rep. Fraley was recognized and commented that while the information from Justice Orr and Mr. Shoop was compelling, he would like for the NCAA, the University and others to present their viewpoint. He stated it was important to hear from all sides before the Commission completes its work. Rep. Fraley commented for the record that a lot of statements being made warranted the UNC system or others to come in to present their point of view; there should be invited presenters with a different perspective to address the Commission before making a committee report. The Chair stated they were heard at an earlier meeting, but they can be brought back for additional information.

Rep. Davis addressed the Commission on House Bill 230 Revised Uniform Athlete Agents Act that was passed out of the House Judiciary I Committee in the 2017 session and then was sent on to Finance where it stalled and was not passed. He will introduce it again for the upcoming 2019 long session (see attachment 6). Rep. Davis asked the Commission to recommend the bill so he could report to the General Statutes Commission that it will be taken up again. Rep. Davis said the bill is to protect student athletes and institutions from unscrupulous athlete agents seeking to handle professional contracts and endorsement contracts. Currently agents have to register with the Secretary of State's Office and conform to regulations set out for them. This legislation would further enforce those regulations and require the agent to contact the educational institution before contacting the student athlete. It would also institute an interstate registration process, but the General Statutes Commission is recommending an instate registration. It extends protection to the current student athletes as well as previous student athletes who have exhausted eligibility to compete within the last six months. The bill adds new criminal penalties and increases the amount of existing civil penalties. Eight other states have entered similar legislation.

Mr. Pogge, Associate Athletic Director, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill was introduced to speak on the recommended legislation regarding agents (see attachment 6a). Mr. Pogge stated the main issue is poor representation of the student athlete resulting in horrible financial positions from incompetent representation. Mr. Pogge added that some agents do not have the athlete's best interest in mind and that the Revised Uniform Athlete Agents Act, would address the problem. Mr. Pogge praised the Secretary of States' Office for their hard work to address this with new regulations from legislation that tightens the law for agents which UNC supports. Mr. Pogge stated that he and Lawrence (Bubba) Cunningham have meetings to discuss how to better protect the athletes and make their experience a good one to position them for future success. He stated that UNC has taken the national lead in trying to fix these issues. He stated that constituent memos are supportive of greater transparency and accountability. Mr. Pogge said this legislation would provide athletes and their families' better access to more information about agents when contacted, as well as, require notification to the school when contacting an athlete to allow the institution to advise the student. He

further stated that the legislation would stiffen the law to correct the current disregard for the law when approaching young athletes.

Sen. McKissick asked what procedure would the institution use or provide if it is notified by an agent since there is no system in place at this time. Mr. Pogge stated that they talk to the players about the many problems that can arise, and if the staff knows ahead of time, they can prevent a bad situation. He further stated that if they need help with contracts or something of a legal nature, the school has resources in the School of Law available. Sen. McKissick asked about the two changes to the bill requested by NC State University and the new cause of action that applies to athletes six months after eligibility runs out. Mr. Pogge said the six month eligibility rule keeps the agents from coming in at the last minute to take advantage of the athlete. Rep. Davis addressed the question about NC State's two changes. He said one is the definition of "athlete agent" and this draft bill elaborates on the phrase "indirectly recruits or solicits" and the second is the bill fills the gap under NCAA bylaws that a student athlete that makes a verbal contract or agency verbal contract will lose their eligibility.

Senator Daniel asked if this bill comes as a recommendation from the Athletic Department. Mr. Pogge said yes it comes on behalf of the University Athletic Department and they support the bill. Sen. Daniel asked what is needed of the Commission to make these changes, would a recommendation to the Legislative Research Commission be in order. Mr. Pogge answered yes they hope to see the bill pass into legislation in the 2019 Session.

Chairman Forest opened the floor for a recommendation from the Commission. Sen. Daniel moved to recommend HB230 Revised Uniform Athlete Agents Act from the information the Commission has been given and subject to changes made in the legislative process specific to the needs of North Carolina. Sen. Daniel asked Rep. Davis what other states have enacted similar legislation. Rep. Davis replied South Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Alabama and many others have enacted similar legislation to what is being proposed. Sen. McKissick seconded the motion. The motion carried. Rep. Davis was recognized to thank the committee and say that the General Statutes Commission will be apprised of the recommendation at the upcoming meeting tomorrow.

The Chair introduced Andy Schwarz, Partner, OSKR and Co-Founder of the Historical Basketball League, to give his presentation The Economics of College Sports (see attachment 7). Mr. Schwarz said he is not representing the associations that he is a member of, but has a personal interest in athletes' rights, individual rights and supports free enterprise and economic competition. Mr. Schwarz explained how educational institutions use accounting practices and budget management to create misleading information on the profits of sports and cited examples. He also said branding of the institution is important to the schools' economic success. But, Mr. Schwarz added that this also boosts diversity in the student population. He also stated that the history of sports from the Ivy League Schools in 1902 until today has been in a 115 year economic crisis, creating higher tuition rates and expenses. He stated that the budgets given to the schools are use it or lose it in most states, but some states have mandates that require

the unused funding be returned to the State (University of Louisiana). Mr. Schwarz touched on student fees included in tuition, amateurism to protect the competitive balance and how this ruling by the NCAA causes money to be spent for buildings and athletic arenas as a recruitment tool. He stated that the system prevents free enterprise and prevents student athletes from marketing themselves to schools and endorsements. He stated that in some sense that money is taken from the athlete and given to the coach (recruiter) which is thwarting capitalism. Mr. Schwarz discussed the economic impact and differences of Title IX and the Olympic Model.

He closed by saying that these athletes on campuses are adults, residents of your State and not to confuse them as property with actually empowering them to be adults in our society. He also said a lot of these students are Pell Grant students below the poverty line and have not handled money before, so this is a reason for financial literacy education. He believes in registering agents but not to the point of infantilizing the athlete resulting in criminal penalties. If a pro bono group of lawyers and advisors is formed by the institution then that would kill two birds with one stone. Lawyers or advisors should participate in this advocacy program while the athletes are amateurs to prove they have the athlete's best interest at heart if they are going to represent them later. Mr. Schwarz stated that agents are a benefit if they are regulated properly - regulate, then funnel that desire to make money as an agent to benefit students. Lastly, he told the Commission to recognize that because of amateurism, the pool is smaller: if student athletes were allowed to make third party endorsements and take sponsorships, there would be money to go around.

Sen. McKissick asked if nationally less than 10% of these schools are making money and are getting institutional assistance to keep their programs running, what is your opinion? Mr. Schwarz replied athletic departments defray the some of the costs so it turns the part that isn't defrayed into bad spending but you cannot call it that unless you compare it to the benefits it brings including campus environment, the ability to attract students and faculty, so never look at the cost without asking what is the benefit. Sen. McKissick asked what Chancellor Dubois would say about related party transactions and his observations about overall costs. Coach Cunningham responded since the Chancellor had left. He said at the four schools where he had worked, four of the ninety-four sports generated more income than they spent, at the others he said Mr. Schwarz was correct that they were subsidized but thought it was a good investment to attract students that otherwise would not have applied. He stated that UNC has an outside entity called the Rams Club that makes a \$17 million contribution to the school's general fund.

The Chair recognized Rep. Fraley who asked the presenter for an explanation of his view about the bill as it relates to agents and representation of the athlete if the athlete has been put in a bad situation, which was different from what he thought was a program to help the student to go forward with their futures as opposed to being pulled into a meeting to answer to accusations without representation and does not see it as the same. Mr. Schwarz answered that everybody else in America gets to vote for those things and do not have to ask permission to promote oneself and the UAAA criminalizes the private act of trying to better oneself which creates a black market. He said he does agree with the vetting of agents that Mr. Pogge presented but felt by passing information



from the State to the School would make the athlete ineligible and would worsen the black market as far as getting representation. Also he suggested having two classifications of representation: *advocate* for undergrads and *representative* for after leaving the school. He stated that North Carolina could say it is against State policy or against the law to ever prohibit anyone from acquiring representation to seek a higher salary to be a higher tax payer –if you force someone into an amateur situation they get a subsidy from the government, but if you let them make money – they pay taxes.

Sen. Daniel was recognized and commented that he was sure that the other states that Rep. Davis listed that joined the UAAA have done due diligence in evaluating these issues and our State will do the same. Mr. Schwarz responded that he would encourage that because he did not think it was a surprise that schools that get the most value for athletes would pass laws making it difficult for those athletes to go elsewhere.

Chairman Forest introduced Justice Bob Orr, Former N. C. Supreme Court Justice and Attorney for Various College Athletes to address the Commission on the Models of Student-Athlete Compensation. Justice Orr stated that he agrees with everything Andy Schwarz said in his presentation. Justice Orr said that he is no expert on economic models for compensation, however he did discuss the core issue around the debate of compensation. He stated that the NCAA and some institutions do not want change that would share the profits with athletes, but do want the discussion of paid athletes to be held because the position is unpopular among the people that want reform have advocated for. They want to mire down the discussion with compensation models that pit men's against women's sports, major revenue sports against Olympic sports, bench warmers against all Americans, large against small schools and all permutations to lead the discussion in circles, provoke controversy, and cause litigation to forestall any significant change. Justice Orr stated that one simple way to remedy the problem would be to allow student athletes to profit from their talent at sports founded on the North Carolina State Constitution Article I, Section I of the Declaration of Rights. He said he believed this principle is directly applicable to students working for their schools for big time business of college athletics. Justice Orr then spoke about the NCAA Impermissible Benefits Rule that would end an athletes' eligibility, lose their scholarship and have to leave college if from a low wealth family, but all people associated with an institution from the Chancellor down to talented students not involved in sports can benefit from their talents without penalization and gave examples from the past of NCAA responses to minor infractions by athletes that come under the NCAA rules.

He then moved on to a presentation regarding the NCAA and how they criminalize conduct that they cannot enforce and convince the States to help them do this. Justice Orr suggested that any high school or college athlete should have full access to properly trained and licensed professionals to guide them without fear of punishment and ineligibility. He added those professionals should be screened and heavily regulated without a great deal of difficulty; students should not be punished for seeking advice for long term success. Justice Orr then suggested the Commission members read The Last Temptation of Rick Pitino, A Story of Corruption, Scandal and the Big Business of College Basketball by Michael Sokolove as an eye-opening insight into one aspect of what is happening in college sports.

Justice Orr concluded that all of the NCAA prohibitions and limitations are founded on the antiquated and hypocritical collegiate model of the NCAA commitment to amateurism that demarks the athletes that participate in the collegiate model from the athletes that participate in the professional model. In addition, he spoke to Rule 2.9 in the NCAA manual “The Principles of Amateurism” that states in part that “student athletes should be protected from the exploits of professional and commercial enterprise” and the hypocrisy of the rule. He reiterated that everyone is financially benefitting. The NCAA is making \$1 billion a year for running a basketball tournament off of the student athletes, except the athletes who are the workforce, the talent, the stars, who put in 40 hour work weeks are prohibited from the fruits of their labor by an oppressive and unfair financial and compensation system that punishes the student for anything that the NCAA does not permit. Justice Orr stated that he had no economic models to share; however, the student athlete needs to stop being punished by the NCAA and have the right to financial gain. Justice Orr thanked the Chair, Commission Members, Staff and others for their interest and assistance to bring this important issue a before the Commission.

Sen. McKissick asked if there are any actual models, compensation models or policy that any of the presenters had that could be shared with the Commission. He would like to see them and review them with the Commission at a later meeting.

Sen. Daniel suggested setting up a trust for athletes using a specific formula based on the revenue of athletics taken in by the institution and by length of enrollment, then disbursing it when the student - athlete leaves the school or graduates.

Justice Orr replied there are two pools of money, one pool is all the money flowing into the athletic system and how would the institution (1) share the pie (2) stop punishing student athletes. Mr. Schwarz suggested a model for compensation is to use capitalism, so athletes can be compensated like the coaches are. Maddie Salamone stated there is another component to compensation: participating in sports and studying takes all an athletes’ time and energy so there is no opportunity to earn money.

Sen. Krawiec asked Justice Orr for his comments on the Uniform Athlete Agents Act and for copies of Coach Shoops’ comments for the Commission members.

Sen. McKissick stated he did not see a problem compensating athletes if an appropriate amount could be formulated to offset expenses and make it less desirable to break NCAA rules.

Chairman Forest thanked the presenters, Commission members and staff, then announced that member comments via email to staff are due on January 18, 2019. The Draft Report will be available to members and the public on February 1, 2019 and will be taken up at the February 14, 2019 meeting.

Chairman Forest adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

---

Lt. Governor Daniel J. Forest  
Chairman

---

Jayne A. Nelson  
Commission Assistant

DRAFT